

REMARKS

Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-7, 9-20 will be pending in the application. The preamble of the respective claims have been amended to identify the invention as “a stereo camera apparatus”. Claims 1 has been amended to clarify the shooting direction. Claim 2 has been amended to incorporate features detailed in the specification. Claim 8 has been canceled. Claim 9 has been amended to be dependent on claim 1. Claims 10-16 have been added to the application. Please note that claims 15-20 are similar to originally filed claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7. Applicants believe that no new matter has been incorporated by this Amendment.

Applicants provide the following remarks to the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-9 be withdrawn. The preamble of the claims have been amended as requested by the Examiner.

Double Patenting (Provisional Rejection)

Applicants note that claim 5 is provisional rejected based upon claim 31 of copending application 09/665,950. Applicants note that the both the present application and the copending application share a filing date of 9/21/2000.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 and 8 are rejected as being anticipated by Miura (US 4,879,596). Claim 8 has been canceled, therefore this rejection pertains only to claims 1-5.

Applicants have carefully considered the rejection and respectfully request that it be withdrawn.

Applicants dispute that Miura (“image pick up elements are adjusted rotatably about their optical axes”) discloses “wherein optical axes of said main camera and said sub-camera are inclined toward the main camera side with respect to the shooting direction between said camera and said sub-camera” as set forth in claim 1. Applicants have also further clarified the shooting direction set forth in claim 1.

Applicants note that Miura discloses a structure wherein an optical axis of one camera can be adjusted in left and right directions, wherein another camera can be adjusted rotably upwards, downwards, and right directions. Even if these features are considered in tandem, Applicants believe that they fail to disclose the structure set forth in independent claim 1 and the subsequent dependent claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6, 7, and 9 be withdrawn because independent claim 1 is not anticipated or obvious in view of the cited prior art.

New Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15-20 are allowable because the cited prior art fails to disclose or teach the following feature of independent claim 15:

“wherein optical axes of said main camera and said sub-camera are inclined toward the main camera side with respect to the shooting direction between said camera and said sub-camera”.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that the application should be allowed. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300. Any overpayment can be credited to Deposit Account No. 02-4300.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 18, 2004

Signature:

Brandon Boss, Reg. No. 46,567
Smith, Gambrell & Russell, L.L.P.
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 659-2811

SGRDC/212564.1

* Practice is limited to matters and proceeding before federal courts and agencies.